

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

*(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)*

VOL. IV

JANUARY, 1940

No. 1

THE LITURGY AND REUNION

I.

IN the last January issue of this review we put forward a tentative article under the present title showing how there was a connection of ideas between many of those belonging to the Œcumenical Movement and the Liturgy Movement understood in a large sense. Hence we argued that the surest basis for reunion work was the Liturgy. We will try, therefore, in this article and in succeeding ones¹, to approach the problem on these lines.

First then, we think that most people will admit that the basis both of the Liturgy and of Reunion is incorporation in Christ. This being so it is our first duty to examine what is meant by this incorporation in Christ. On this Father Congar may be quoted: "This incorporation in Christ is begun and effected—and this is all-important—by contact with Christ in the sacramental order, that is, an order of outward and visible signs in which our faith in Christ is expressed, and which in virtue of the special efficacy attached by our Lord to their symbolism, link us with the unique and historic fact of the redemption and the salvation won for us in Christ dying and risen for us. The sacraments are not, strictly speaking, new acts, but, under the spiritual mode of a symbolic-real celebration, the true substantial presence (Eucharist) or the sanctifying power (Baptism) of the redeeming mystery of Christ. The baptism of a Christian adds nothing to Christ; it is not, in relation to His passion and resurrection, a new act, but it brings this passion and resurrection into actual and effective contact with the Christian; it brings him within the scope of the saving work which Christ accomplished for him, and makes actual for him the reconciliation and life won by the passion, as well as the communion with the

¹ We hope to have a series of articles from different writers on this common subject.

Blessed Trinity into whose name he is baptised. Similarly, the Eucharist, which Latin Christians to-day call the Mass, does not repeat the sacrificial death of Christ, and is not strictly, so far as the Cross is concerned, a new act, but it represents and makes present Christ as offering, so that the sacrifice of Christ, wherever Christians are gathered together, is repeated without ceasing to be unique, being at once the sacrifice of these Christians and of the Church, and the fulfilment by these Christians of that which was accomplished once and for all for them by Christ.

The function and the meaning of the Christian sacraments is to ensure that Christians are thus put into contact with the Lord Himself, their Saviour, the self-same Saviour who, as a matter of history, was crucified and rose again; and that the life which is in them should be the very life of Jesus Christ. The sacraments are nothing less than the means by which the oneness and the uniqueness of the mediation of Christ are made actual, here and now, for us. Baptism, in which justification by faith is given as well as symbolized, expresses and effects this justification *in Christ*, by the very fact that we are sacramentally associated with His redeeming passion and resurrection. In the Eucharist, the charity by which the soul enjoys full communion with the divine life is both expressed and given, signifying and effecting our vivification and incorporation *in Christ*. In every way the sacrament is at once the sign and the effective means by which our life of faith and love is mystically the life of Christ dying and risen again, and whereby the mystery is truly lived by the Church which is His Body.”¹

It is evident from this that we can rest our examination of the problem of Reunion from a liturgical point of view on the sacrament of Baptism and of course on that of the Holy Eucharist when considering those Christian bodies who have retained a certainly valid ministry. We may here quote from Mgr. Neveu's instructions to French army chaplains in regard to how they should minister to Orthodox soldiers:² “In virtue of his baptism, every Orthodox becomes a member of the One and Universal Church. He therefore belongs *de jure* to the Catholic Church so long as he does not commit a formal act of schism, a mortal sin that is punished with excommunication, for excommunication is never incurred but for a mortal sin. When I am in the presence of an Orthodox Christian, I know that there are nine presumptions against one that this Christian has not committed the sin of schism. As it is morally certain that

¹ *Divided Christendom*, by M. J. Congar, O.P., pp. 62, 63.

² The whole quotation is given on another page of the present issue.

this Christian has not committed a mortal sin punishable with excommunication, and as I, a Catholic priest, cannot affirm *a priori* that this baptized Christian is *delinquens et contumax* (Canon 2241), nor that he has committed a *delictum externum, grave, consummatum, cum contumacia conjunctum* (Canon 2242, I), which alone is punished with censure, I have no right to suppose, without strong evidence, that he is severed from the communion of the faithful." Here Mgr. Neveu has in mind an Orthodox soldier who has recourse to the ministry of a Catholic priest when he is wounded or gravely ill. The point we want to make is this attitude of accepting the status of our fellow Christian because of his baptism.¹ Again from all this we may conclude that we may speak of a "Sacramental Union" of Christians that already exists (though it may not be very consciously recognised) and this all the more so as we are dealing in terms of life of which the liturgy is the divine-human instrument. Christendom is more extensive than the visible reality of the Church; theologically it is a question of in what *manner of belonging* are non-Catholics members of the Church.²

We would venture here to bring before our readers the thesis of Father Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M., an Anglican Religious. He is dealing with the problem of Reunion from a similar angle: "*Reunion inward and outward*" he terms it. He says that "true Reunion must begin by being 'inward,' in the sense of being based on the really existing Divine Unity of the Kingdom of Christ and His redemptive work and man's acknowledgment of that by faith. Further, it cannot take place between any Christians who have become divided unless a consciously realised unity of faith has borne fruit in a unity of love and concord." He then goes on to speak with disapproval of plans to achieve Reunion based on a purely outward unity³: "the acceptance of Episcopacy as the organ of government, as a matter of order and not as a matter of

¹ We quote here the essential part of the Anglican ritual from the *Book of Common Prayer* :—

"Name this child.

And then naming it after them (if they shall certify that the child may well endure it) he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily, saying :

N., I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

But if they certify that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour Water upon it, saying the foresaid words :

N., I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

It is more usual to pour the water.

² For the status of our separated brethren see *Divided Christendom*, pp. 221—240.

³ This we think is a reference to the South Indian scheme for a union between Anglicans and some Protestant missionaries.

faith." . . . "Remember," he says, "the two meanings of 'inward.' It can mean in relation to Unity either the mystery of faith which is the basis and ground of Christian unity : or the unity of love and concord which is the normal fruit of this. It is a great snare to extol the second—the spirit of goodwill and friendliness—and to ignore the first. . . . The true hope of reunion lies in the emergence among all sorts of Christians of diverse confessions, of a revived orthodoxy, which acknowledges the Biblical faith in God and in our redemption through Christ by the Holy Spirit in the Mystical Body." In illustration of this he quotes some cases of outward schism but unity of belief and also unity of love and concord. For instance, this is so between some Orthodox and some Anglicans, and again between some Anglicans and Catholics, or again between some Anglicans and some orthodox-minded Congregationalists or other Protestants, or even between Catholics and Confessional Christians in Germany. "In each case there is a unity of belief in the redemptive work of Christ which is the basis of Christian unity, while there remain certain outstanding points which cannot be dismissed as unimportant—the question of natural theology: the Papal claims : the Protestant doctrine of the Church—and other points connected with these or arising out of them. There is hope of reunion here : there can already be a unity of love and concord, and a desire on both sides that the disagreements may be overcome. There may be in some of these cases material heresy, but there is not the will to heresy, and there is a will to unity."¹

We are well aware that at this juncture St. Augustine's attitude to schism or that of the early Fathers of the Church to heresy might be quoted in opposition to the thesis. Our reply is that St. Augustine and the Fathers were concerned with the origins of schism and heresy. They were dealing with those who were causing division. We are in different circumstances ; we are trying to heal divisions centuries old and we are not dealing with persons who have a will to heresy. So though we cannot ignore the Fathers in representing the tradition of the Church to schism and heresy, our present problem is different from theirs.

Now in approaching the problem from the point of view of the Liturgy another factor besides that of sacramental life has to be considered, namely that of Tradition, apostolic Tradition in its pure state, and here we mean no mere static principle but the *living* faith and tradition of the Church.

¹ These quotations are from the article "Schism, Outward and Inward" in *Sobornost*, July, 1939. The article is well worth reading in full, though we do not agree with the whole of it.

The Platonic Tradition and the Liturgy 5

Dom Lialine, in his article last year, has made clear the importance of the study of Tradition by the eirenic theologian.¹ So it is evident that here we have another link between the liturgical and the eirenic approach to the problem of reunion. This being so, we would bring this searchlight of the Liturgy and Tradition to bear on different Christian bodies so that we may discover the precious portions of the Truth that are preserved in them. In thus contemplating the Truth, certain tendencies in Catholic practice may also be examined, so that in this way the vision of integral Catholicism may be made clear; for only in this way can Reunion be prepared for.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

THE PLATONIC TRADITION AND THE LITURGY

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We offer the following article of Dom Bede Griffiths, a monk of Prinknash Abbey, which has been sent in to us as the first of three liturgical articles; it raises certain interesting questions, *e.g.*, the attitude to the Liturgy at the time of Clement of Alexandria and Origen; was there a conscious liturgical background to the mystics of the Eastern Church; the rise of individualism in the East, etc. We would be grateful for comments on these points or on the article in letters to the Editor.

NO one who knows anything of Christian mysticism will deny the immense influence which has been exercised upon it by Platonism. Beginning with Clement and Origen in the school of Alexandria in the second and third centuries, it soon permeated the Eastern Church, reaching its culmination in the work of the so-called "Dionysius the Areopagite," while it entered the Western Church with St. Augustine and was consecrated in this form throughout the early Middle Ages by St. Gregory.² When the works of Dionysius were translated into Latin in the later Middle Ages, yet another phase of Christian Platonism began; of which the effect can be seen in our English mystics in such works as the *Cloud of Unknowing*; until finally with St. John of the Cross it became, as it were, the canonised form of Catholic mysticism.

¹ Vid., "Concerning the Eirenic Method," by Dom Clement Lialine, in *THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*, April, July and October, 1939; especially in the April issue, pp. 348—355.

² Christopher Dawson in *Mediaeval Religion* writes: "As Abbot Butler has shown in his work on Western Mysticism this Augustinian mystical tradition is carried on by St. Gregory and St. Bernard, the two most influential spiritual writers of their respective periods and dominates the spiritual life of the Western Church down to the age of scholasticism." (*Ibid.*, Part I, § 2, iii, p. 40).

Now the peculiarity of Plato's philosophy, as all will agree, was that it regarded the body as the "prison house" of the soul, and was therefore led to consider human perfection to consist in the liberation of the soul from the body and the consequent "assimilation" to God. That there is an element of truth in this theory, which must naturally appeal to the Christian, is obvious, and it is this, no doubt, which accounts for the fascination which it has exercised; but it is no less obvious that it contains a serious error. A Christian can never regard the body merely as the prison of the soul: on the contrary, it is for him the God-given instrument of the soul by means of which it must realise its perfection. So sacred is the union between the soul and the body that St. Paul does not hesitate to compare it with the union of Christ and the Church (1 Eph. v, 29). From this conception of the relation of the soul and body it follows that, whereas the Platonist seeks for union with God by an escape from the world of the senses, to the Christian the material world is nothing less than a revelation of God. The whole universe is a sacrament by which the Word of God is revealed to man, as St. John seems to hint in those mysterious words in the prologue to his gospel, where he says: "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not" (St. John i, 10). Again the Platonist, even if he does not regard matter as evil in itself, is still far from believing that it is good, and consequently he is unable to conceive of any relation existing between God and the base matter of this earth. It was this which above everything kept the Platonist from Christianity in the beginning and made him often its bitterest enemy. But to a Christian the very centre of his religion lies in the mystery of the Incarnation, in the fact which St. John again records with incomparable simplicity: "The Word became flesh" (St. John i, 14). God, who created the material universe and saw that it and all that was in it was good, also deigned to take upon Him a human nature with a body formed of this earthly matter; and thus for a Christian the whole world has been made not merely good but holy, because it has become the temple of the living God. Finally, to the Platonist, the soul's ascent to God was of necessity a solitary and laborious way. It involved the gradual withdrawal from the life of the senses and affections, even from the life of thought, until the soul was led into the solitary splendour of the "divine darkness". But the Christian, having a "new and living way through the veil" (Hebrews x, 20), as the author of the epistle to the Hebrews says, in the flesh of Christ, is not separated from the world of sense or from his fellow men. For Christ gave us His

Flesh and Blood to be the food of our souls and thus consecrated the bodily senses, while by the mysterious power of this same sacrament He unites all who partake of it in one body. As St. Paul says: "We being many are one bread, one body, for we all share in the one bread" (1 Cor. x, 17). In these three ways, therefore, Christianity is seen to be fundamentally opposed to Platonism. The Platonic way is ascetic, whereas the Christian is sacramental; the Platonist seeks for union with God by means of liberation from the body, the Christian by means of union with the body of Christ: the Platonist's heaven is a solitary state of ecstasy with an incomprehensible being, the Christian heaven is a communion of saints in the Mystical Body of Christ. It need hardly be said that this opposition is not seriously felt in the great Christian mystics; it was their peculiar genius to reconcile these apparent opposites and to find in Christianity the fulfilment of the Platonic ideal. But it cannot be denied that the influence of Platonism has tended to draw Christian mysticism away from its sacramental and corporate, in a word, its incarnational character, and to make it appear a solitary and ascetic ideal. Against this tendency there can be no more powerful force than the Liturgy. For it is in the Liturgy that the sacramental character of Christian worship stands revealed. It is by the sacrament of water that we are initiated into the faith; and when Christ would give Himself to us in the most intimate manner conceivable, making Himself our very food, He took the common elements of bread and wine. When these gifts are offered on the altar, it is a sign of the offering of the whole earth to its Lord and Creator, like the bread and the wine which Melchisedech offered to the Most High God, "the Creator of heaven and earth" (1 Cor. xiv, 18); while the burning of candles and incense represents the ascent of the prayer of all creation through the ministry of angels up to heaven. Thus when the Word descends upon the elements and transforms them into the very substance of His Flesh and Blood, it is the sacrifice of all creation which is accepted and offered through its Head; and we behold the great drama of the Word being made flesh and communicating life to the world enacted before our very eyes. Nor are we mere passive spectators of this drama. The sacrifice is our sacrifice also, and we ourselves are offered up in union with Christ our Head: and as by His sacrifice He is made to partake of our human nature, so we by union with Him are made partakers of His divinity. There can be no greater or deeper mystical experience on earth than this: it comprehends in itself the purgative, the illuminative and the unitive way. The senses are purified by learning to

apprehend the sacred mysteries under sensible forms : the mind is illumined by contemplation and union with the Word made flesh ; and the soul is united to God in its inmost depths by the communication of the divine nature. Finally this is no solitary ecstatic experience ; it does not take place in the desert or on a mountain. It is the "marriage supper of the Lamb" to which all are invited. Here all are initiated into a common faith and share in a common life ; all together offer a common sacrifice and partake of a common meal ; and all are united as one man in the Body of Christ, whence, as St. Paul says : " the whole body through the joints and ligaments being nourished and compacted together increases with the increase of God " (Col. ii, 19). DOM BEDE GRIFFITHS.

THE WEST SEES THE EAST AT PRAYER

STUDENTS of the West who are interested in the re-union of Christendom owe a great debt of gratitude to Father Basil Krivoshein for his interpretation of the ascetic and theological teaching of Gregory Palamas, published in the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY in 1938. For it seems to the writer of this review that in Palamas we have at once a Greek writer representative of a broad tradition and typical of an even broader current of Orthodox ascetical thought, whose principles and main conclusions can be explained without much difficulty to us Christians of the West in our own technical terms, and thus explained can find acceptance—if not in every detail, at least in broad outline—by the most scholastic and traditional amongst us.

Let us summarize as briefly as we justly can Father Basil's presentation of the doctrine of Gregory Palamas. If man is made in God's image, man himself must be the principal source of his knowledge of God who, transcending every limitation of apprehension, cannot be *known* by reason. Father Basil expresses this in a formula we have to correct later : " it is impossible to apprehend God by reason or to express Him in words " ; for the moment let this pass. Hence, continues the theology of Palamas, man's way to God is through his own heart, in so far as the heart may be considered to be the source and sustainer of man's intellectual activity. The divine likeness becomes more apparent by the purification of the soul : first by the observance of the commandments, because this, unless it be mere pharisaical outward observance, leads to inward purification of the passions ; secondly, by

the practice of mental prayer, the mind contemplating exterior objects, thence returning upon itself, and finally rising up to intuition of God "as in a glass darkly." There is thus a threefold purgation of the active, cognitive and contemplative powers by good works, knowledge and prayer.

Let us pause awhile to consider this position in the light of common Catholic doctrine. St. John of the Cross at once springs to our mind as an outstanding proponent of the idea of God's transcendence of all created intelligence, and of reason in particular. God is knowable by human reason only analogically, *per viam remotionis et excellentiae*: we can only say that God is not material, not mortal, not limited; that in God intelligence, will, life, being, mean something infinitely more excellent than such examples of these perfections as may come under our worldly purview. Moreover, human reason can neither discover, nor comprehend when revealed, nor adequately formulate the final truth of God—the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity. But, as Père Gardeil has recently reminded us, that an intuitive knowledge of this mystery is granted to the purified contemplative soul is the doctrine of St. Augustine in *de Trinitate*. The above outline therefore of Palamas is in complete harmony with Catholic tradition in the West.

The result of the experimental knowledge of God which comes through contemplation, pursues Palamas, is "illumination." "God is called light not according to substance but according to energy." Hence God's direct action on the soul He inhabits is illumination, "uncreated radiance," immaterial, supernatural, differing not in degree only but in nature from rational knowledge. Nor does this illumination always remain hidden in the soul: it manifests itself in higher contemplatives in a supra-sensible irradiation—the light of Thabor, shared by God's chosen ones. We need not agree with Gregory's philosophical postulates that this is a necessary consequence, or kind of natural effect of the interior illumination of the soul if we agree, as we do agree, that this phenomenon is a verified fact in numerous cases, that it is a grace given by God to chosen souls, and that purification of the soul, progress in sanctity and the presence of contemplative intuition are necessary conditions for its manifestation. To deny this one would be compelled to deny well proven facts in the history of the saints from Moses to our own generation.

The agreement between these essential points of Gregory's doctrine and the common Western tradition is reflected in many lesser details also. Thus we read it is grace that "mysteriously accomplishes the ineffable union" of the soul with God; and "primary importance" in religious progress

is to be given "not to the outward doing nor even to the acquiring of this or that virtue but to inward purification from passions"; hence "prayer is higher than the practice of particular virtues." Again ecstasy, the bugbear of the true contemplative, is deprecated: "the sending of the mind out of the body that it may seek intellectual visions without is the greatest of Hellenistic illusions and the root and source of every wrong thinking." Methods of prayer again are of a secondary importance, as Gregory's own recommended method "is not binding on all those who would reach perfection in prayer, but is merely recommended, and that chiefly to beginners."

It remains, however, to be said that not all that Father Basil Krivoshein approves in the doctrine of Palamas could meet, with the approval of a Catholic theologian. We cannot agree—for example, that "man, just because he has a body, is more truly sealed with the Divine Likeness than are purely spiritual angelic natures." Man, having a body, because he has a body, in the natural order is a lower representation, a less likely likeness, of God the supreme spirit, because matter is of its nature unspiritual and limited. It is true that in the supernatural order man, elevated by grace, can by repeated meritorious acts under the influence of actual grace, rise to a higher degree of graciousness, *i.e.*, likeness to God, than the angel, meriting his supernatural rank by a single perfect act of his whole simple being. It is true that the possibility of man's repeated acts is occasioned by the fact that he is not a spirit, *i.e.*, that he has a body; but the *cause* of the merit, and hence the cause of the progress in spiritual similitude to God, is under Providence man's spiritual acts of intelligence and will, faculties of the soul, not of the body. The philosophy underlying Catholic theology everywhere sets its face against Manichaeism, but nevertheless upholds with equal vigour the supremacy of the spirit.

Another point of disagreement is the value of "omphaloscopy." The eyes are a source of great distraction in prayer, and mayhap the fixing of the eyes on the stomach or breast, together with the "position of the body, bent and humble," will assist in reducing disturbances of the soul from this ever open gateway, though we think the practice of closing the eyes or casting them down is at once more common and more efficient. Is there any positive advantage in "omphaloscopy"? Most canonized saints seem to have got along without it. As to the breathing method of attaining concentration, the writer honestly thinks it is more likely to lead to mere bodily sleep. It is well, therefore, that we are warned that "Gregory teaches that its rôle is purely subsidiary."

DOM H. D. THOMAS RIGBY.



Engraved by Philip Hagreen.

Courtesy of C.F.L. St. George.

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

Both the Roman and Byzantine Churches keep the feast of St. John Chrysostom on January 27th, the anniversary of the translation of his relics under the Emperor Theodosius II in 438. The Byzantine Church also keeps his feast on September 14th, the actual date of his death (in 438), and again on November 13th, the Feast of the Three Holy Hierarchs.

THE STATUE HOMILIES OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

PERHAPS the freshest source for the study of the life of the Church is the homiletic literature of the patristic age. The great and holy orators and doctors are seen at work in their homilies in a unique setting. Their theological works smell not infrequently of the lamp, and, what is more, are of necessity explanations and deepenings of the Christian fact in terms, in the light, within the limits, of the prevailing non-Christian philosophy. That Christian fact, just because it is a fact, a datum, vital, is ineffable, and will of course constantly elude such expression, will by force break down the limits of a man-made thought-system and reveal, down unexpected vistas, one or other outline of a

Christian world-view—St. Augustine's de-intellectualized platonism is a good example; but the human philosophical background remains. In a sermon we are on different ground. The context is the service in the midst of which the preaching takes place. The Church is at home here, asserting herself and her life entirely in her own way. In this atmosphere we hear the hierarchical leader of the community speak words that form a part of the life-act at present being exercised by the community. These words share the nature of this act—they are wholly and entirely and simply Christian, they treat of reality in the light of the few simple and above all real postulates evolved by Christian thinkers or forged by them from the truth of merely human thinkers to express the Christian fact in that vital and life-giving liturgical philosophy of the Church we can best call her Prophecy. Oratorical and elaborate some patristic preaching may be, tinged it may be with contemporary extraneous conceptions of the universe—this laborious tooling and this philosophy are secondary, a mere undercurrent foaming here and there to the surface of the smooth main stream of freshness and of stark untrammelled Christian life. Of this stream we must drink deeply.

Here we may survey the general contents of the famous "Statue Homilies" of the best-loved hero of eloquence of the East, ὁ μέγας διδάσκαλος τῆς οἰκουμένης, St. John Chrysostom. At the age of thirty-two this deacon was ordained priest. It does not seem to have entered into the functions of the deacons of his town of Antioch to preach, for we have no sermons from his mouth before his ordination in 386; however, the favourite pupil of the pagan rhetorician Libanius was set to preaching by Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, as soon as he was ordained, and very assiduously did he ply his office, preaching apparently at least once a week, often much more; and very much was he relished by that impressionable people, to judge from frequent references to applause in his homilies. His ordination had been in the early part of 386, whose Lent he had preached, and in February 387 he began his second Lent. Easter fell that year on April 25th at Antioch, where the Alexandrian computation was followed.¹ The opening of Lent, on the Monday of the seventh week before Easter (forty days of Lent preceded the Great Week) fell on March

¹ See Baur, P. Chrysostomus, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, München 1929, Vol. I, p. 213, n. 6. We must not be astonished if we find Easter kept in that year at Alexandria on April 18th. Bishop Theophilus advanced it to this somewhat earlier date in order to shock Roman opinion a little less than such lateness must of necessity have done. But see Schwartz, Ed., *Christliche u. jüdische Ostertafeln*, Königl. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen Abhlg., N.F., 8, vi; 1905.

8th, and near the end of February Chrysostom began to lead up to his Lenten preaching with the sermon we know as the first of the Statue Homilies.

His plans, which we glimpse in fragments here and there in the remaining twenty homilies of this Lent, were somewhat scattered by a short but violent riot which shattered Antioch one day in the ten which elapsed between the first homily and the Saturday before Lent began (March 6th). A new tax had been announced by the representatives of the Emperor Theodosius near the end of February—an unbearable exaction the Antiochians thought it¹—and a turbulent minority of cosmopolitans who had long troubled Antioch by their presence, a foreign and very mixed lot, ξένοι δέ τινες καὶ μιγάδες ἄνθρωποι² took advantage of the growing discontent to stir up a riot. This took the form of high-treason by an outrage on the Imperial statues. The Imperial authority, with all its reminiscences of the Emperor-cult, was represented in the public places and official buildings by statues of the Emperor and his family, worked in precious metal. The mob insulted these statues and even overthrew many of them, dragging them about with ropes in derision and leaving their fragments for the children to play with. The revolt was checked within a few hours, before the mob could proceed to the burning of the imperial residence. Officers arrived, imprisonments and executions began, Bishop Flavian rushed to Constantinople to plead with the Emperor for leniency. When Chrysostom resumed his preaching with the second homily, seven days after the first, in the latter half of the last week before Lent, a dark cloud of lament and terror hung over the city. This terror and the events and all the rumours of hope and despair which followed coloured the Lenten preaching until Flavian returned at Easter with news of the Emperor's clemency.

Our knowledge of the course and the nature of events is derived from these twenty-one Statue Homilies of Chrysostom. From the second homily, and the third (given on the Sunday before Lent began), onwards through Lent he interwove into his Lenten διδασκαλίας a running commentary on events. We also have four discourses composed by the pagan rhetorician Libanius, recognized master of Antioch's culture and representative of what seems to have been a largely pagan local government. Chrysostom's sermons are living waves in the actual tide of events; Libanius composed his after all was over, at considered leisure, and—significant enough for the age—used Chrysostom's own sermons for his account. In a study

¹ Chrysostom tells us so, Hom. 3, No. 6.

² Hom. 2, No. 3.

of Chrysostom's homilies it is important to note that out of two hundred and twenty columns of text only thirty at most deal with the course of events. These may be found in any history, and we shall here limit ourselves to pointing out the emphasis Chrysostom lays on the civic status of the ring-leaders of the riot. He has an immense pride in the city of Antioch, again and again calling it "mother of all, and their common nurse"¹; "of all the cities lying to the East the head and the mother is our city. . . . Think of the greatness of the city, and of how we are here dealing with the head of the whole world (περὶ τοῦ κεφαλαίου τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης). This is the city where first men were called Christians: honour Christ, revere her who first announced a name so desirable and sweet to all."² Combined with this sense of the city's dignity, and possibly reinforced by it, he has a conviction that "what has happened is not attributable to our citizens, but to foreign, abandoned men."³ This text, one among many, is of great interest for the determining of the political composition of the Empire, pointing as it does to the presence in Antioch of a turbulent cosmopolitan minority against whose loose morals Chrysostom was constantly inveighing in more tranquil times, and at whose door he has no hesitation in laying present troubles. Chrysostom's veneration of the imperial dignity might also be remarked upon, but what we are chiefly concerned with here is the place of the events of the revolt in these homilies. We have mentioned above the materially small bulk of what treats directly of the revolt or of the subsequent events. Indirectly these events are often very briefly referred to in the course of, or as the occasion of, exhortation to more complete Christian life. These exhortations, however, more often flow from the preacher's preoccupation with the topical task of reminding his auditors that the Lenten fast must be accompanied by virtue if it is to serve its purpose of purifying them for participation in the Easter Mysteries; "This is the meaning of fast, and Lent and so many daily services, sermons, prayers, teachings (διδασκαλῖαι): that abolishing the stains of sin which have in whatever way clung to us, during this year, we may be made partakers in all spiritual confidence of that bloodless sacrifice."⁴ In fact, though coloured by the reflection of the terrors outside, in church Lenten preaching held its accustomed and well-loved course.

This course we shall now endeavour to trace by a description of the homilies and of their treatment of their main subjects. It must be noted that the insurrection is by no

¹ Hom. 2, No. 2, col. 21D. References are to the Paris ed., 1718.

² Hom. 3, No. 1, col. 36 and 37.

³ Hom. 17, No. 2, col. 174D.

⁴ Hom. 20, No. 1, col. 199 AB.

means the exclusive preoccupation of the preacher. Prominent among his subjects is the tremendous campaign against vain oaths and against taking the name of God in vain which he waged all through this Lent. The distribution of these exhortations in the homilies is significant. In the first homily vain oaths are condemned in the peroration at some length and the people are begged to take every step to avoid them; they are to assist each other, to be urgent in public and before the pagans, to make it an indictable offence in their own homes to swear, visiting it on their family and domestics by sending the whole household supperless to bed if this ingrained habit of the city showed itself but once in the day. The second homily reflects to an unusual degree the terrors that had burst upon the city since the first, and oaths are inveighed against in relation with the sedition. But after the second homily, as Chrysostom's Lenten themes get into their stride, there is an exhortation against oaths of about five hundred words at the end of every homily, as its final exhortation, except for the thirteenth, the eighteenth, and the twenty-first, where oaths are hardly mentioned, and the fourteenth and nineteenth which are wholly against swearing.

The text of any of these exhortations would show their urgency and their very intimate nature, addressed as they are to the detail of the every-day life of the people, in a paternal and familiar tone that reveals much concerning the contemporary attitude to such things, and the relations between pastor and flock. "Let us remember," says Chrysostom, "those three things I spoke of to your charity (*πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην*), begging you to have no man in enmity, to curse no man, and to cast out from your mouths the wicked habit of swearing. Two of these we will deal with at some other time; but during the whole of this week we will treat of vain oaths, beginnings with the easiest precept. For there is no real labour involved in conquering this custom of swearing, if only we are ready to apply even a little care, reminding each other, rebuking each other, being watchful one for the other, and calling the forgetful to account and to punishment. . . . If then we are thus diligent this Lent, suppressing our swearing this week, extinguishing our choler the next, cutting out detraction by the roots the week after, and afterwards correcting many things more; by gradual progress we shall little by little come to the very summit of virtue, flee safely our present dangers, and propitiate God."¹ It is arresting to see a young priest, ordained a year ago, speaking to "the people of Antioch" as follows: "So do what I asked yesterday, what I say to-day, what I will not rest from saying:

¹ Hom. 4, No. 6, col. 57 E and 58 C and D.

prescribe a fine against swearers, a fine that will be their gain, not their loss. And prepare immediately to show me proof of your progress. For I will endeavour to speak at length with each of you after the assembly is dismissed, so that by long conversation I may find that you have mended; and if I find any swearing, I will denounce him to the emended, so that by rebukes, correction, reproofs we may quickly deliver him from the evil habit"¹

The terror-ridden days of the repression which immediately followed the riot served to enforce Chrysostom's pleading. The homilies do indeed give us important commentaries on the course of events, as the priest reassures, informs, shares with, interprets to, the people the comings and goings of the bishop, of the officials, and the rumours of despair and hope which attended them. But equally important and no less interesting are the far more numerous passages where Chrysostom seizes on the situation as a heaven-sent episode which must be lived out by the Church of Antioch in a "pneumatic" way. "Let us not grieve, beloved ones, at the fear the magistrates are causing us, but let us even give thanks to God for correcting our tepidity, for making us more diligent."² Not that he underestimated the dire straits of the city, not that he failed to feel in himself every blow which descended: "Grief cuts off my doctrine, I can scarcely open my mouth, loosen my lips, move my tongue to give words. Grief is a bit in my mouth, detaining my tongue and holding in my speech."³ There are vivid descriptions like this one: "Now we see how those who sin against men are punished. For some have been put to the sword and some to fire, some have perished by wild beasts, and not men alone, but children too. Nothing could save them, not extreme youth, not the excuse of general unrest nor the fact that these things were done by a few who were under diabolical possession; not the intolerable amount of the tax, not poverty, not part-responsibility, nor promises for the future. Nothing was of avail, but they were dragged without mercy to the execution-place, driven on on either side by armed soldiers who prevented any rescue. And their mothers followed, watching from afar as their sons were decapitated, but not daring to weep their loss. Terror overcame nature and love, and like men on shore who see a shipwreck with grief yet are unable to save the drowning, these mothers were too terrified to come near, too terrified to save their sons, too terrified even to bewail them."⁴

But his chief preoccupation is to take all that is happening

¹ Hom. 6, No. 7, col. 84, B and c.

³ Hom. 2, No. 1, col. 21 A.

² Hom. 6, No. 1, col. 74 c.

⁴ Hom. 3, No. 6, col. 45 c, d.

on a higher ground than that of even such sufferings. "I lament and mourn now, not because of the greatness of the coming punishment, but because of the madness of what has been perpetrated. For even were the Emperor not enraged, were there no punishment to bear, how should we, tell me, sustain the ignominy of such crimes?"¹ Thus stressing the moral side of the events more than the material side, he is able to give point to his exhortations against blasphemy, to beg for more attention to the whole of the good life, to set himself to steady and console a populace unbalanced by fear. "And as when we hear the levy of tribute we each go home and call our wife and children and our domestics, and take thought with them how we can find this money: so let us do for this spiritual levy (ἐπὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν πνευματικῶν), let us, when we return from church, call our family and tell them a spiritual tribute has been imposed to-day, a tribute, I say, by which will come delivery and freedom from these our troubles; the tribute . . . of cutting off our oaths."² Indeed, what has happened has already caused an increase of Christian life: "You and your conscience bear witness how much we have gained by this trial. The dissolute have become modest, the savage milder, the tepid zealous. Those who never saw the church, but spent their whole day in the theatre, are now to be found from morning to night in church."³ The note of consolation is often sounded, and Chrysostom makes it a special duty and care to administer παράκλησις in almost every sermon: "We have spent many days consoling your charity, and we shall continue to do so until our care has cured your wounds of sadness. . . . The magistrates terrify you, the priests must console you; the authority of the city threatens, the Church must reassure. . . . Because they have terrified you and filled you with care, the Church, common mother of all of us, opens her bosom and stretches wide her arms and receives us to her, daily consoling us and telling us that it is profitable to fear the magistrates, profitable too to receive the consolation which follows."⁴

The Church and the assembly always seem to take a large part in this consolation. After a long lamentation on the state of the city Chrysostom says: "I would here have done with speaking. . . . But lend me your ears a little while, lend me your souls, cast off your sadness; let us return to what we used to do: as it was our custom always to come to this place with joy, let us do so now too, casting all our cares upon God."⁵ The church is the place where somehow all

¹ Hom. 2, No. 1, col. 20 E—21 A.

³ Hom. 4, No. 2, col. 52 B, C.

⁵ Hom. 2, No. 3, col. 23 D.

² Hom. 3, No. 7, col. 47 E.

⁴ Hom. 6, No. 1, col. 73 A—D.

the fears of the forum are made to fade before other joys : " The forum may be desolately empty, but the church is full ; we mourn for the forum, the church fills us with joy and pneumatic joy. When therefore, beloved, you go to the forum and groan at its desertedness : take refuge with your Mother and at once she will console you with the multitude of her own sons ; and she will show you a perfect choir of brothers and will cast out your sadness."¹ We are shown often what it is that makes the church a place of " spiritual joy," by such passages as this : " I see you are consoled, by your zeal and your desire to hear. . . . I see you attending with great goodwill and concentration, casting out present anguish by the desire to hear."² They came to hear, but to hear what ? There is a revealing passage in the sixteenth homily³ where Chrysostom complains : " Lo, this is the second year that I am preaching to your charity, and I have hardly been able to explain one hundred lines of Scripture. And why ? Because you need to be told by me what you could arrange for yourselves at home, and all my sermons are spent on moral exhortations. But things should not be thus, but it is for you to look after the morals, for me to expound the sense and give the doctrine of the Scriptures (τῶν γραφῶν τὰ νοήματα καὶ τὰς θεωρίας)." In spite of the time he has had to devote and will have to devote this Lent to morals, especially to vain oaths, he can still say : " It is now time for us to spread before you from St. Paul your *accustomed* table, and to set forth the lesson read to-day and to replace it in the midst for everyone."⁴ This brings us to a further subject which has a large place in these homilies—the exegesis of the liturgical reading of the season. Besides the passages we have just quoted many chance references show how this commentary was expected, demanded and loved.⁵

The first two of this series of homilies deal with two texts from the last chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, and are devoted to the lessons for practical Christian life and the ways of God in the sufferings He permits to overtake His saints. The next five homilies are busy with vain oaths and with the Christian philosophical bearing under the strain of the events in the city. In the seventh homily Chrysostom speaks on the sedition at first, but soon makes a kind of apology for having dwelt on it so long in the previous sermons and announces that it is time to settle down seriously to Scripture-

¹ Hom. 4, No. 1, col. 49 A.

³ No. 2, col. 162 E—163 A.

² Hom. 4, No. 1, col. 48 A.

⁴ Hom. 2, No. 4, col. 25 E.

⁵ See for this eagerness and for the fact that the commentaries were on the readings of the day, also Hom. 1, No. 1, col. 1 ; Hom. 4, No. 1, col. 48 ; Hom. 6, No. 3, col. 77, No. 7, col. 83 ; Hom. 7, No. 1, col. 85 ; etc.

commentary. However, for that time he is content to show how the Genesis description of creation is a continuation, by its marvels, of the consolation he has been giving, and it is not until the end of the sermon that he lays down a sort of programme for the next sermons, saying: "You see how the whole of Scripture is a consolation and an encouragement; we shall speak of this at the right time, but before this it is necessary to tell when this book (*i.e.* Genesis) was put forth; for it was not written at the beginning, immediately after Adam, but many generations later; and it is worth the labour to seek why these generations intervened, and why at last it was given to the Jews alone and not to all men; why in the Sinai desert; for the Apostle does not pass lightly over this place, but even here lays out for us great doctrine (μεγάλην θεωρίαν), speaking thus: 'For these are the two testaments. The one from Mount Sinai, engendering unto bondage.'"¹ In the eighth homily, however, presumably preached at the end of the week, he is forced to say: "But come, let us to the matter we are here to expound. For I quite realize that you are all panting for it, all and each of you hoping to find out for what reason this book was not written in the beginning; but I see that even now it is not the time for this explanation (ἐξηγήσεως). What then? This week is drawing to its close and I fear to lay hand to this question only to drop it at once. For this matter needs many days, and must be carefully dwelt upon; so let us put it off once more."² He therefore proceeds in this homily to show from a text of Genesis the dread consequences of sin. In the ninth homily he is at last able to reach the promised explanation. He shows that Genesis was not given to us at the beginning, but only under Moses, "because God wished to teach human nature not by letters but by things."³ The next half dozen homilies follow this up in a broad sweep of vigorous exposition of how the universe and its order, how man and his beauty and marvellous construction combined with the frail texture of his fallen state of mortality, reveal to us God the all-powerful and all-wise Creator for our worship. A second "thesis" (ὑπόθεσις, Hom. 7, No. 1) follows, showing how man had given him the natural law as a guide for his action.

In all this we must specially note Chrysostom's stress on nature. The account of the creation which he tells us was read in Lent evidently allowed him to expatiate at large on a subject which he considered of great importance. He describes the human body minutely, he stays long on the wonders of the eye. He loves the detail of the universe, and he enumerates also the wide sweep of creation with a kind of anticipatory

¹ No. 4, col. 89 E—90 A.

² No. 1, col. 92 B.

³ No. 2, col. 99 A.

pleasure. "When ye hear that He made heaven and earth, the sea, the air, the waters, the many stars, the two great lamps, the plants, four-footed things, the swimmers and the flyers, all that ye see around ye, because of you, for your salvation, your honour, do ye not receive therefrom great consolation?"¹ His reviews of the creature are full of movement, he sees all as as warm with life and culminating in life. "Night is of no less service to us than day. For as I have said of trees, that fruit-trees are equalled in usefulness by other sorts of trees, which save us from cutting fruit-trees for our building purposes; and wild animals are of equal usefulness with tame ones, making us gather for fear of them in cities, making us more wary, and binding us as fellows together; showing the courage of one man, providing medicine for the ills of another: reminding us of our ancient sin. . . . As therefore I have previously mentioned, all things work together for our life; and night is as useful as day, bringing rest to labour and healing to ills."² Perhaps this delight in nature may be seen at its highest in a lively comparison which significantly shows how our fathers instinctively saw everything in a "liturgical" light; nature for them was essentially dynamic and in this dynamism they loved and plunged straight for that mainstay of Christian symbolism, the cycle: "Who could tell the harmony of the seasons, how they follow one another, keeping perfect measure, like maidens dancing in a ring!"³

We can best sum up Chrysostom's exegesis by quoting a passage of enormous importance which tells us what he conceives as the mental preoccupation of Christians: "In the market-place or at court we hear nothing of what we philosophize (φιλοσοφείν) in church, we hear nothing spiritual (πνευματικόν). In church it is quite the contrary; of heaven and the things of heaven (περὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ πραγμάτων: is this the firmament or the next life?), of the soul, of our life, and why we were made, and why we remain here such a time, and to what we go, leaving here, and what will then receive us, and why our body is of clay, and what is the nature of death, what in fact is life, present and future: nothing earthly, but of pneumatic things are all the words we hear; and we receive great viatica of our salvation (τῆς σωτηρίας ἐφόδια) and leave the church with plenty of hope."⁴

In the Statue Homilies we have then the Lenten preaching at Antioch in the year 387. Statue Homilies they may be called with reference to the events of that year; they may be called so with reference to the relatively few passages in them

¹ Hom. 7, No. 2, col. 86 B.

² Hom. 8, No. 1, col. 91, D, E.

³ Hom. 9, No. 3, col. 101, A—B.

⁴ Hom. 10, No. 2, col. 106 D, E.

which concentrate on the revolt ; but the best justification of the title may be found in the atmosphere which the revolt lent to Chrysostom's Lenten preaching. Atmosphere it gave, and no more. If his plans for doctrine were deranged, it was more by the citizens' need for moral exhortation than by the events of the Statue Riot of Antioch.

DOM WILLIAM McLAUGHLIN.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

We remind our readers again this year of the Church Unity Octave, January 18th to 25th. There is more need than ever to pray for Christian Unity, and it is an encouraging fact that more non-Catholics than before are joining in this Octave of prayer : Orthodox, Anglicans, and a number of continental Protestants.

FINLAND.

Since recent events have brought Finland before the public eye, we may briefly state the condition of the Orthodox Church in this country.

From the thirteenth century until 1809 Finland was for centuries debatable land between Sweden and Russia. East Finland was annexed by Russia in the time of Peter the Great. But before the fourteenth century the great monastery of Valamo, on an island in Lake Ladoga, was founded by SS. Sergius and Germanos. Also in the sixteenth century, Trifon, the apostle of the Lapps, built a monastery at Petsamo on the Arctic coast. There is also a monastery on another island in Lake Ladoga, that of Konoveto, and a convent of nuns at Lintula. These Russian monastic foundations are the basis of the Orthodox Church in Finland.

Since 1919 Finland has been independent of Russia. Archbishop Herman is the head of the Orthodox Church there and resides at Helsingfors. There is also another bishop, one Alexander of Viborg. There are about thirty parishes with about 70,000 faithful ; there is a seminary at Sortavala, and on Valamo the monks have established at one of their *skete* an orphanage for Finnish boys, from whom they may hope to recruit future monks since the government requires the monks to be Finnish subjects. The Orthodox are on good terms with the Lutherans and the state supports both the Lutheran and Orthodox Churches on equal terms.

In the October number of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY of 1939 (p. 489), reference was made to Father de Caluwe, a Dutch Catholic priest of the Byzantine rite, who is working in Terijoki.

The Catholics of the Latin rite number 2,500 and are under the rule of a vicar apostolic.

All this Christian work is threatened by the Bolsheviks.

THE POSITION OF THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH UNDER THE SOVIET REGIME.

After an extended period of Soviet occupation of the Ukrainian regions of former Poland, it becomes possible to form a general idea of the position in which the Ukrainian Church united to the Holy See finds itself.

The material below is based on the testimony of trustworthy eye-witnesses who lived under the domination of the Red troops in Western Ukraine and whose testimony is verified by the Belgian Redemptorist Fathers who recently returned to Belgium when it became impossible for them to continue their religious services among the Ukrainian population of Western Ukraine.

It is necessary to stress the fact that the church dignitaries and all the clergy remained faithful to their posts among the faithful knowing well that the rigours of the communist régime will be directed against them in the first place.

Metropolitan Szeptycky is confined to his quarters together with his brother Father Clement, Abbot of the Studite monastery at Univ. A forced contribution of 600,000 zlotys has been imposed upon the Metropolitan, making non-payment an act of sabotage. Since the properties of the Metropolia have been confiscated he has been able to pay only 30,000 zlotys which was everything he had.

The Apostolic Visitor for Volhynia, Mgr. Czarnecky, has been thrown out of his residence and confined to a convent in Lviv. Mgr. Chomyshyn, Bishop of Stanislaviv, has also been confined to a convent. Already he has had to make three visits to the Commissar of the G.P.U.

All the seminaries and Catholic schools have been closed and their properties have been confiscated. Religious teaching has been prohibited in all schools.

All the religious orders have been dissolved, especially convents of nuns. The publishing house of the Basilian Order has been taken over by the Soviets and is now being used for the publication, among others, of anti-religious pamphlets. The libraries and archives of the several orders have also been seized by the Bolshevik authorities.

All the religious orders have been thrown out of Volhynia and the Jesuit church in Pinsk has been demolished.

The staunch defence put up by the faithful is perhaps the only reason why the churches are still open and Mass still said. All indications show that the people are more than ever attached to the church and this seems to have made a profound impression upon the Bolsheviks. There are cases in the country where the courage of the inhabitants has so impressed the soldiers that they themselves have begun to learn prayers and attend services.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT IN THE U.S.S.R.

The Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R. is trying to adapt itself to the difficult conditions of its existence. There are noticeable tendencies to simplify the rites ; previously all the church functions were exercised by the priests, but the number of priests is falling out much faster than the number of faithful, and therefore, ordinary people very often carried out religious functions. This is happening with the full approval of the hierarchy.

The leader of the Godless, Yaroslavsky, writing in the eleventh issue of *Partrinyoe Stroitelstvo*, says that within the U.S.S.R. there are being established *Kolhosp* (Collective Farms) churches. Separated from the state, the church has found a new social basis among the kolhosp peasantry.

"It would be possible," he writes, "to give examples where the church is literally supported by the kolhosp. Kolhosp brigades even prepare wood for the church and receive regular work-day pay for this labour."

Yaroslavsky claims that the church is receiving a certain amount of support in the cities among the workers and among the Soviet intelligentsia. According to Yaroslavsky "millions of people still believe that without the will of God not a hair will fall from their head and that everything is in God's hands."

CATHOLIC ARMY CHAPLAINS AND ORTHODOX SOLDIERS.

Mgr. Neveu, Administrator Apostolic of Moscow, at present residing in Paris, issued instructions to army chaplains as to how to deal with Orthodox soldiers at the front. It is an important document, which has far-reaching consequences in the theology of our attitude towards Separated churches. He writes :—

"(1) In virtue of his baptism, every Orthodox becomes a member of the One and Universal Church. He therefore

belongs *de jure* to the Catholic Church as long as he does not commit a formal act of schism, a mortal sin that is punished with excommunication, for excommunication is never incurred but for a mortal sin. When I am in the presence of an Orthodox Christian, I know that there are nine presumptions against one that this Christian has not committed the sin of schism. As it is morally certain that this Christian has not committed a mortal sin punishable with excommunication, and as I, a Catholic priest, cannot affirm *a priori* that this baptized Christian is *delinquens et contumax* (Canon 2241), nor that he has committed a *delictum externum, grave, consummatum, cum contumacia conjunctum* (Canon 2242, 1) which alone is punished with censure, I have no right to suppose, without strong evidence, that he is severed from the communion of the faithful. We should not forget the rules of interpretation of ecclesiastical laws, as laid down in *de Legibus*, or the principle of Canon 19 : Penal laws must be interpreted in their strict sense. *Odiosa sunt restringenda*. And that is the case here.

Canon 2218, 1, advises those called upon to punish and censure to take into consideration the amount of responsibility, the knowledge, ignorance, and the mentality of the delinquent, the circumstances of time and place in which the fault has been committed. The Church acts with restraint. So let us do likewise, dear confrères, and refrain from imputing grievous sin to a man outwardly separated from apostolic communion without any fault of his, whereas we are in possession of the full truth for no merit of our own and by sheer grace of God. Canon 2241, 1, says that *censuræ, præsertim latæ sententiæ, maxime excommunicatio, ne infligantur, nisi sobrie et magna cum circumspectione*. Who tells me that millions and millions of Oriental Christians, involuntarily severed from Rome, are but a mass of excommunicated people ?

(2) I may without indiscretion quote an incident that is known to me personally. The Holy Father, Pius XI, who died uttering the word 'peace,' and who exactly knew the extent of his duties and rights, would certainly not have given his blessing to excommunicated people in a state of mortal sin. But I know for a fact that he gave his paternal blessing to a pious Russian Bishop, then still Orthodox, saying that he considered him as his son, which so moved the Bishop that he decided to make at once his official submission to the Sovereign Pontiff. I may add that this Bishop died as a confessor of the faith in a Communist dungeon in 1935. Pius XI also blessed as his own Catholic children, Orthodox Christians, still separated from the Roman communion, but who suffered for the Christian Church. Have we, then, a right to be more Catholic than the Pope ?

(3) When it happens to you, dear priests, to meet one of these Christians of good faith, who has recourse to your ministry, because he sincerely looks up to you as the priests of Jesus Christ, be sure of this : here is an involuntary victim of the divisions brought on the Church by the fault of men. That man who calls himself an Orthodox is right in insisting on being so called, for it is evident that he refuses to admit any error in his faith, nor any conscious and voluntary disobedience to the One and Universal Church of Christ, whose member he has been since his baptism. I will therefore refrain from fastening on him the odious name of schismatic. He is rather a Catholic who is ignorant of himself and of his true mother through the fault of his forefathers, through the fault of a civil government, which found it wonderfully convenient to deal with a national church, which it could govern at its own sweet will, through the fault, whether wilful or not, of a clergy prejudiced against Catholicism : that such a man should call himself an Orthodox, what more natural ? I am Catholic and Orthodox also, since in the first prayer of the canon at daily Mass I pray *cum omnibus orthodoxis atque Catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus*.

Hence, dear soldier-priests, you have only to deal with a man who has recourse to your ministry as you would deal with a Catholic and brother in the faith. If he is wounded or gravely ill, make sure of his good faith, which you may anyhow presume. Get him to make an act of faith as explicitly as possible in the authority of the visible head of the Church, and hear his confession as well as you can. A decree of the Holy Office of July 20th, 1898, allows the absolution of material schismatics in good faith, provided there be no scandal. All the more may we absolve a Christian who declares that he wants to live and die in communion with the Universal Church and the Vicar of Christ. You may then content yourselves with the general and ordinary formula of absolution. . . . Then give him extreme unction and the Viaticum, if there is time, and have no hesitation in giving him the honour of a Catholic funeral. . . ." (From *The Tablet*, 11th November, 1939).

The argument was further taken up by Father Henry Davis, S.J., in *The Tablet*, 2nd December, and by Miss A. Christitch in that of 16th December, 1939.

A MEETING OF THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE OF FAITH AND ORDER.

The Continuation Committee was again held at St. George's School, Clarens, Switzerland, in 1938 from August 21st to 23rd.

In the absence of the Archbishop of York, the chair was taken by Pastor Boegner. Thirty-seven members, including officers, were present: eight substitutes for absent members; some others representing the Youth Group, and some visitors. The Orthodox present were the Archbishop Germanos, Bishop Seraphim, the Archpriest John Janson, Father Florovsky and the Archimandrite Cassian. The report before us deals with the two conference sessions: one the discussion of plans for the study of Ways of Worship, and the other the Commission on the Church.

I. In connection with the first of these it was felt that there was a need for the appointment of two commissions, one to study the Ways of Worship and the other the question of Intercommunion.

The terms of reference of the Commission to study Ways of Worship are:—

- " i. To study the Ways of Worship characteristic of the different Christian traditions with a view to promoting growth in mutual understanding among the Churches.
- ii. To include a study of the place and function of preaching and instruction in Christian worship, and to pay attention to non-liturgical as well as liturgical traditions of worship.
- iii. To consider not only what are the existing traditions of worship, but also the experiments in 'liturgical creation which are being made in œcumenical and similar gatherings and in the younger Churches, and the principles which should inform future developments in the field of worship.'
- iv. To conduct, as it thinks fit, liturgical conferences at which members may share by experience in unfamiliar forms of worship.
- v. To issue leaflets explanatory of different traditions of worship and to present to the Committee a report embodying the results of the Commission's work which can serve as material for discussion at a future World Conference on Faith and Order."

In order to fully understand numbers ii and iii of the above some allusion must be made to the discussion.

The suggestion that the function of preaching in Christian worship should be studied came from Bishop Brilioth (Church

of Sweden). He referred to the exhortation as part of the Liturgy during the first five centuries of the Church, noted a big change when "the homily was dropped out of the Latin Mass" and stated that "in the Lutheran Church of Sweden the sermon is properly part of the service and it is an act of worship," whereas in the Anglican Church to-day the sermon is regarded as "a kind of address added on to the service."

Later, Bishop Talbot (Church of England) said he "thought that the terms of reference should not be confined to the study of existing forms of worship, but should take into account the future, having regard to what the worship of the great Church of the future was going to be. Anglican worship at the moment was in a state of movement and in need of revision. Its Prayer Book was lamentably lacking in stress on the Resurrection, but Anglicans were learning from the Orthodox a better proportion and that the Cross must never be dissociated from the Resurrection. If we were going merely to say what were our existing forms of worship we should be trying to fire at targets that were always moving."

Dr. Visser't Hooft (Swiss Church Federation) then made five points. He agreed with Bishop Brilioth's suggestion. He hoped that the Commission would see that the various ways of worship were explained to them by members of the respective churches to which they actually belonged and not simply by someone interested in that church. He agreed with Bishop Talbot's proposal. He wanted the question of common worship (*e.g.*, as made at Amsterdam or that of the World Student Christian Federation in *Venite Adoremus*) to be critically examined by competent people. He also wanted the question of "spiritual communion" examined.

The following letter from Father Sergius Bulgakov had been circulated among the members of the Committee: "I feel deeply satisfied by the proposal of our secretary to include in the programme of the future 'Commission on Ways of Worship' the paragraph from Chapter IV of the Edinburgh Report on the devotion of the Mother of God. I am heartily supporting this proposal which will be certainly received with great satisfaction in the Orthodox world (and, I suppose, in the Roman Catholic, too). The future movement of this discussion in the œcumenical theology is necessary.

I agree that this discussion may be included in the series of 'leaflets describing different traditions of worship'. It would be desirable there to express the different mariological doctrines of different Christian confessions. If we pass over this question once more in silence, it will make an unfavourable impression of a certain evasiveness on an important question. I personally should like to participate very willingly in such a leaflet.

"I think that the discussion might be concentrated on the following questions :

1. The meaning of the Mother of God for the Incarnation.
2. The sanctification and glorification of the Mother of God in connection with it.
3. The place of the Mother of God in the Church and in the whole of mankind.
4. The meaning of the devotion of the Mother of God for the reunion of Christianity and for the whole Œcumenical Movement.

I ask you to read this paper in the meeting of the Continuation Committee for the year 1939."

II. The Commission of the Church.

Dr. R. Newton Flew (Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge), the Chairman of the Commission and Dr. G. W. Richards, Chairman of the co-operating American Theological Committee, presented reports. Dr. Flew, in sketching the kind of treatment that should be given to this subject, suggested (as the result of extended discussions and correspondence) that they should produce four books on the Church instead of one as in the case of the *Doctrine of Grace* and *The Ministry and the Sacraments*.

The books should deal with the subject as follows :—

- i. On Biblical Doctrine.
- ii. An Historical volume ; *i.e.*, the idea of the Church in Christian theology from the second century onwards till the nineteenth.
- iii. The "Confessional" volume ; *i.e.*, the statements of the various communions, declaring the views held by them with regard to the Church.
- iv. Dogmatic or Systematic, containing constructive statements aiming at a synthesis of the varying views, and at a doctrine of the Church which would be accepted by all of us to-day.

He then went on to explain the volumes in further detail. The explanation of volume iii is interesting : "We agreed that each of these statements should begin with the particular confession of faith to which that communion is pledged, and then proceed to indicate the views held in that communion to-day about the nature of the Church. It is not enough to quote articles in a confession of faith framed some centuries ago. But it is an infinitely difficult task for one man to put down on paper what any one communion holds to-day as its doctrine of the Church. I am suggesting that these constructive statements ought to have a greater authority than that of any single theologian, if possible."

The members of the Commission were approved by the Committee; the following will give some idea of its representation:—Dr. Flew, Chairman; Rev. K. Riches (Church of England), secretary; Professor L. Hodgson, the Bishop of Gloucester and the Rev. A. R. Vidler represented the Anglicans; the Archimandrite Cassian, Professor Alivisatos and four other theologians represented the Orthodox; two Lutherans, a Baptist, a member of the Reformed Protestant Church, a Presbyterian, a Disciple of Christ, one of the Society of Friends, a British Congregationalist, one representing the Reformed Church of France, one Old Catholic, two belonging to the younger churches, and five appointed by the American Committee.

The American Committee consisted of Principal Davidson, Dean W. L. Sperry, Professor Angus Dun, Dr. John R. Mott and Dr. G. W. Richards. They also had eighteen persons considered to be "outstanding types" of American Christian denominations working with them.

Further discussion of the reports was rendered impossible by the premature adjournment of the Committee on the evening of August 23rd.

At the conference three papers were read on "The New Testament Teaching on the Church," by the Archimandrite Cassian (Russian Orthodox Church), Professor J. de Zwaan (Reformed Church of the Netherlands) and Professor Wahlstrom (Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America).

We hope to refer to these interesting papers in another issue during the year.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DEAR FATHER,

I have just finished a perusal of the July and October numbers of the *E.C.Q.* One is everywhere surprised to find the influence of Latin Christianity in the East, sponsored by Latin ecclesiastics and apparently taken up with eagerness by the Oriental Catholics themselves. One reads of such devotions as Benediction, Holy Hours, etc., for the conversion of the dissidents.

Concentrating more upon the legislative side one finds definite Latin influence on Armenian canon law, and all received the approval of the National Assembly held in Rome, 1911. Even the *Rituale Romanum* is enforced in adminis-

tering Extreme Unction. It is to be noted too that students of the Roman college are obliged to celibacy; they appear to be the only members of the clergy that attain to the higher offices in the Church. One cannot fail to notice that ancient customs retained by the Gregorians are no longer observed, but others borrowed from the Roman Rite take their place.

Surely all this gives true and valid grounds to the charge that if the East is to be united with Rome, it must be at the expense of their ancient traditions. Though the late Holy Father has spoken strongly against this latinization of the East, in practice his words seem to be ignored. Not only this but those reunited to the centre of Unity seem determined to adopt Latin customs. If we are to do anything in the East we must be tolerant and sympathetic to those who have been educated and steeped in another tradition, but, may I ask, in point of fact, are we?

Yours,

CLERICUS.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Catholic Centre. By E. I. Watkin. (Sheed & Ward). pp. 247. 7s. 6d.

Those who are acquainted with the other works of Mr. Watkin will long have expected some such book as this. He has written a book called *Men and Tendencies*; here we might apply that title to Mr. Watkin's own case. The book indeed goes far to show Mr. Watkin the man and his tendencies. Of course, one finds in this book many of the qualities which distinguish all Mr. Watkin's work. His is not a superficial mind, nor does he write with the thick and easily smudging ink of journalism. Nor could anyone doubt his obvious sincerity and desire to follow the lead of Mother Church. There are some passages of quite peculiar beauty and depth, especially in the first chapter (on the Liturgy), and the tenth (on immanence and transcendence). Yet I must confess that the book as a whole leaves an impression of uneasiness and tension, of clouds and hard lightning flashes.

The first thing I feel about the book is that it does not really justify its title. When one proposes to speak of the "Catholic Centre," the hearer or reader expects above all an investigation of what makes Catholicism the centre, then a comparison with non-Catholic and possibly Catholic deviations. Instead, Mr. Watkin starts by describing and criticizing deviations and then proceeds to give his own view on what

Catholicism should be in order to realize the perfect *via media* reconciling all those extremes. Now, this method, though risky, could bear fruit if it were conducted on firm objective lines, and if one desires to speculate in an objective way one has to keep in close touch with the concrete reality of human life, in other words, with history. Now, in spite of the reference to Mr. Dawson at the head of the book, the criticisms not only of the Church but also of other systems and world-conceptions often enough betray a lack of historical sense which I simply refuse to attribute to historians of Mr. Dawson's calibre. When, for instance, Mr. Watkin speaks of "the ecclesiastical patronage of social injustice" during the Middle Ages (p. 146), he speaks of material facts completely severed from their essential surroundings and examines them in the light of a psychological and social outlook which belongs to our age and not to a bygone past. To speak of ecclesiastical patronage when the people to whom this refers were both lords temporal and spiritual simultaneously is not to understand what the situation really was, so clearly shown in that seal of Bishop Hatfield of Durham (c. 1350) which displays on one side the bishop, on the other the knight. We may criticise the combination, but it *was a combination*; it was an ecclesiastic superadded to a temporal lord; it was not an ecclesiastic putting his spiritual foot into a temporal plate. This holds good even where the temporal lord misused his spiritual power to strengthen his political position: in that case he still acted as a temporal lord in the temporal order with spiritual means. That such quaint combinations could exist should prevent us from judging too hastily the complicated situation of our Middle Ages. I have chosen this point deliberately because I think that a comparison between the *mixture* of spiritual and temporal in the East and the *combination* of those two elements in the West would throw much light on both situations.

Having said this I think that it must be clear that I think the basis of Mr. Watkin's criticisms of Catholicism very subjective, and it seems to me that here I touch on precisely the point which caused that unsatisfactory impression of the book in spite of many valuable points. The book seems to be much less of an impartial and grandiose investigation of Catholicism as the centre (of what?) than an occasion for the author to unburden himself of too many personal reactions and to pour out a bitterness with which one can sympathize but which neither persuades nor constructs. The book is a spiritual memoir of the author, and I cannot help resenting that he has chosen the ambitious title of *The Catholic Centre* to adorn these individual reactions to individual circumstances.

If I may be allowed to mention a few minor points first, I shall afterwards be able to speak more freely of the major theses of Mr. Watkin. And these major theses I think are two : in order that the Catholic Church be veritably the centre it should draw its principles and inspiration from the liturgy, and secondly—a theme rather than a thesis—the denunciation of “ecclesiastical materialism.”

One of the constantly recurrent themes of the book is the out-and-out wrongness of Fascism. From time to time this is specified as Nazism. It may be very patriotic in times such as these, but one can be patriotic without falling into sweeping and senseless generalizations. If we condemn and fight Hitlerism to-day it is because of what it has become, not because of what it intended to be. Mr. Watkin is completely unaware of the gradual development and the internal complexity of Nazism. Does he know, for instance, that in the beginning Hitler took his social theories from the Catholic Dr. Lueger of Vienna? Does he know something of the situation in Germany before Hitler rose? I think he does know about these things, and it only confirms my impression that his own sweeping generalizations have swept him off his feet. This becomes clearer still when we hear him speak of the “majority of the Fascist countries supporting their tyrants” (p. 112, n.). I know of only one Fascist country and that is Italy, and I know that Italy is very different from Germany, and that the two of them differ again very much from Spain and Portugal and Ireland and Turkey, if all these have to be termed “Fascist.” Well, I am not going to discuss politics, but I wish to point out that the lame attacks on Bolshevism and the fanatic anti-“Fascist” feelings of Mr. Watkin show a strange familiarity with the Leftist Catholics of France headed by Maritain and papers like *L’Aube* and *Temps Présent*, and these tendencies can in no way be called representative of the Catholic Centre.

Another favourite theme of Mr. Watkin is the presence of mysticism outside the Church. Now, I confess that when I see modern writings on mysticism, I feel an apprehension which almost amounts to repulsion. The reason is that not even in the best works is sufficient attention paid to clarity and delimitation of the subject. To give only two examples : when moderns speak of mysticism, do they mean the ontological reality of mystical experience, or its psychological manifestation(s) which *alone* make it accessible to science? All the mystics we can study have had a *special* vocation in regard to their experience, in other words, the mystical phenomenon with which they present us is frankly *charismatic*. Hence the other question, when moderns speak of mysticism do they

mean to include or to exclude this charismatic aspect? Now, especially the last case is of the utmost importance when we discuss "mysticism" outside the Church, because the charisma is essentially given for the sake of the *community*, either for its inner edification or for an apologetic purpose. In both these cases it is exceedingly difficult to see how there can be charismatic mysticism (which, as suggested, is practically always the only subject possible to a science of observation like psychology) outside the Church. Mr. Watkin seems to make very light of the difficulty that, if we can prove and may accept a fair amount of *genuine* mystics outside the Church, we may draw the conclusion that the highest summit of perfection is, relatively speaking, equally accessible to those inside and outside the Church, and this seems to destroy any intrinsic reason for belonging to the Church, and consequently reduces the Church to a mere accident, which it is doubtless better to take into account, but which has no ultimate claim.¹

Now, I know that Mr. Watkin will put down such an argument to my "ecclesiastical materialism" and a tendency

¹ Mr. Watkin insists again on the fact that some Catholics are slow in accepting Plotinus's mysticism as genuine. He has some scholars on his side, such as Paul Henri, S.J., but many others of perhaps greater value as thinkers against him, such as J. Maréchal, S.J., and Jean Guitton. I really think that with many others Mr. Watkin mixes too much intellectual achievement (which can reach very far) and mysticism. If we compare the mysticism of St. Augustine and of Plotinus by intellectual statements and similarity of words (as, for instance, F. Henri does, especially in his *Vision d'Ostie*) it is easy to draw a line under both lists of statements, count up and say that four equals four. Only, such a treatment makes abstraction of the system as a whole and of the personalities in question. If we compare whole with whole, as Guitton has done in his masterpiece *Le Temps et l'Eternité chez Plotin et St. Augustin* we reach quite opposite conclusions. Now, in the *Dublin Review* of 1932 (pp. 55-56), Mr. Watkin says, speaking of Plotinus's system: "A comprehensive and profound system. Its two radical defects—the lack of an adequate doctrine of creation which made the universe a necessary reflection of God, and the failure to distinguish in matter its positive being which is good from its defect of being the source of evil—*can be removed without prejudice to the structure.*" Moreover, he admits that Plotinus had a "*too abstract and impersonal conception of Deity*, and inadequate perception of the volitional factor, and, above all, a stoic self-sufficiency for which the attainment of bliss lay in man's unaided capacity, . . . (Pl. admitted) *prayer, as a turning of the mind to God, though characteristically not by that name.* Prayer as humble supplication for divine aid he rejected" (64, *italics mine*). It was exactly on creation that St. Augustine's relations with Plotinus split. Creation, indeed, implies, postulates a personal God. A system from which creation and a personal God can be "removed without prejudice to the structure" is irreconcilable with Catholic philosophy and fundamentally incapable of mysticism. To speak of Plotinus and the preceding Christian Alexandrian thought and subsequent Catholic philosophy as in unbroken continuity baffles me completely in a thinker like Mr. Watkin. For further reference about the pantheistic implications of Plotinus's thesis see F. Maréchal's second volume of *Etudes sur la psychologie des mystiques*, p. 82.

ad majorem Ecclesiae gloriam which he seems to oppose to the *ad majorem Dei gloriam* (p. 141). But where is the opposition between the Church and God, between God and his Kingdom, between Christ and the prolongation of Christ in mankind, between the life of God and the deification of man's life? For this is the Church, not only ideally but in the concrete.

And now I pass on to the first of the book's two theses: ecclesiastical materialism. This attack on ecclesiastical materialism is announced as soon as page two. But already at this very beginning I feel myself at variance with the author. He says that the perfect *via media* is not realized in the concrete by the Catholic Church. Had I not to do with a thinker like Mr. Watkin I should let this pass as simply less accurate than desirable. But I think that in this case, and especially in a book which is called *The Catholic Centre*, such a statement is false. One may distinguish between good and bad Catholics (however we may like to interpret the "bad") and we may distinguish between good and bad in the Church's history, but it is one thing to denounce particular persons, tendencies or periods and another to accuse the Church or even to say that the Church is not up to her rôle. The Church as constituted by the sacramental order, as distributing and living by the sacraments, as fundamentally and invariably cleaving to the actual and virtual doctrine of the Revelation, this Church is immaculate, the Bride of the Lamb, the Body of the risen Christ. The duality of good and evil in the Church does not come from an inherent duality in her own constitution but from the inherent duality of good and evil in the persons that make up the Church. The evil comes into the Church with the human persons. The Church-principle which is the life of Christ is sown into our souls in Baptism, but it remains to us to conform more and more our concrete ways of life to this concrete principle. Baptism takes away the guilt of original sin, it does not take away the effects of that sin, the loss of integrity and the presence of disorder. Now, these human persons are substantial unities, complete wholes. The Church does not only take the soul but also the body; she does not only take the human person as sanctified by Christ but also as still labouring under the penalty of sin. In so far as these remains of sin are one with the human person and because the whole human person becomes "Church," evil enters into the Church. Now, when we speak of the Church we should carefully distinguish between the Church as such and the persons who make up the Church. But the Church as such is not an abstraction: she is made concrete in the sacramental constitution of each person, and in so far as a person is baptized, confirmed, ordained, receives the other

sacraments he is constituted part of the Church immaculate; if he fails to live up to these conditions it is the human person who is guilty, not the Church, and it is because of this guilt that he may be condemned to Hell, where the Church can never go. Moreover, this is shown by the fact that the Holy Ghost does not necessarily withhold his assistance even from popes like Alexander VI. On the other hand the Holy Ghost does not assist and guide an abstraction: He guides the Church, and this Church is thereby proved to be something very concrete indeed. It would therefore be more exact to stick to the term "Catholics" rather than to bring in "the Catholic Church" or "Catholicism" when we meditate upon the Church.

After this theological discussion of "ecclesiastical materialism" I want to show how closely the conclusion, reached at before, affects history. Just as in each human member of the Church good and evil meet and make the history of a human person, so do they meet in groups of persons, spread over various regions and various periods. Then good and evil are called Christianity and paganism. And so Prof. Powicke could say: "The history of the Church is the record of the gradual and mutual adaptation of Christianity and paganism to each other."¹ I will quote Prof. Powicke in full, the passage is simply admirable in depth and clarity: "By paganism I mean a state of acquiescence, or merely professional activity, unaccompanied by sustained religious experience and inward discipline. It is not a state of vacancy and scepticism. It is confined to no class of persons, and is not hostile to, though it is easily wearied by, religious observance. It accepts what is offered without any sense of responsibility, has no sense of sin, and easily recovers from twinges of conscience. At the same time, it is full of curiosity and is easily moved by what is now called the group-mind. It is sensitive to the activities of the crowd, is often emotional, and can be raised to those moods of passion, superstition, and love of persecution, into which religion, on its side, can degenerate. A medieval, like a modern, man remained a Christian because he was born a Christian, and most medieval Christians were probably men of this kind—not a few popes, cardinals, bishops, monks, friars, and parish clergy, and a large number of the clerks who had no cure of souls. The medieval Christian was, according to his lights, respectable. He was generally far too much interested in life, had too much to do, and was too affectionate, to be habitually cruel or sensual or superstitious. His life was inseparable from that of the community to which his Church gave a variety of colour, here

¹ *The Christian life in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1935, p. 8.

radiant, there distressing. Although in periods of crisis he suffered decadence—sometimes widespread and horrible—casual decadence is more likely to have affected, not the conventional Christian, but the truly religious man. The history of the Church is the record of the gradual and mutual adaptation of Christianity and paganism to each other. The complete victory of the former has always been a remote vision. St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians show how the attempt to persuade their converts to put away earthly things taxed the patience and energy of the earliest apostles. The task became impossible when every member of any political organization was supposed to be a follower of Christ. The influence of the Church penetrated social relations through and through, and it is foolish to feel surprise if Christianity suffered in the process. . . . From the first the Church was the victim as well as the victor, and as it absorbed the peoples of the Mediterranean in the west and spread eastwards into Persia and India, its spiritual life was shot through and through with the glittering fancies, the anti-nomianism, the morbid extravagances and the endless subtleties of men. It tried to purify a great sluice into which all the religions, every kind of philosophy, every remedy for the troubles and ennui of life had passed. And from this ordeal it passed on to cope with the mental and spiritual traditions of the great northern peoples. *If we imagine that the Church was able to work upon a tabula rasa, we cannot understand the development either of its theology, its ritual, or its religious experience.*"¹ I think this bears out in history what I tried to explain theologically. Prof. Powicke is not a Catholic, yet how different are his approach and understanding from Mr. Watkin's. It is not a matter of whitewashing, but merely of calling black black and white white, in other words, of truth. But then, truth requires delicacy, not only of mind but also of heart, and this delicacy makes it impossible to judge without toil and painful care.

Besides the theological and historical aspect of "ecclesiastical materialism" there is the psychological side of it. It seems to me that no other form of religion can rival with Catholicism in the certainty it breeds in its adepts. Its intransigence that knows of no compromise, its powerful dogmatic assertions, its completeness, both spiritually and "materially," its efficiency, its frankness, its wide resources for the satisfaction of all that is noble and beautiful in man, all this together, combined with a history which is an argument in itself, brings about a great and strong feeling of rest, of sureness, of possession. I am not at all sure that this feeling must be branded as complacency; personally, I have met with

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 7—9, italics mine.

slackness, lightheartedness, grossness, but never with real complacency on the point of Catholic religion. There is certainly very little of this complacency among Catholics where other religions are concerned. On the contrary, the feeling of possession of the truth rather fosters indifference, but I can well see that as soon as a Catholic puts forth one of his religious items he is accused of being conceited. The fact is that the Catholic, and I speak in particular of the "cradle"-Catholic, is perfectly convinced that the whole of his religious reality is above him, is not based on anything earthly, is divine, and therefore *given* in its all-embracing completeness. This is in his very bones and a tradition of this feeling breeds a mentality which is unique as a religious mentality. The average Catholic (I am, of course, not limiting myself to England) *knows* that Catholicism can never be overthrown, that it is able to face any adversity and any attack, that it contains the answer to every question and every need, whether this answer can be immediately formulated or not. Now this completeness and certainty of Catholicism give a completely different colour to the self-assertion and the self-defence of Catholics and non-Catholics. Especially in those religious bodies which separated themselves from Rome out of reaction, this spirit of reaction will always remain present, whilst this spirit is, as such, absent from the Catholic mind. Though this spirit of reaction is a limitation of the religious horizon, it has this advantage, that it fosters the spirit of combat, of greater preparedness; it tightens and strengthens the feeling of membership. But what happens with the Catholic, especially the "cradle"-Catholic? His being received, or living in the Church, brings an immense relief, a feeling of contentment, of satisfaction at being in possession of the truth, and this has, of course, the result in the less fervent that a halt is called to the urge towards perfection; being sure of the road and being sure of being on the road, we forget (and often enough refuse) to go on. The wideness, the completeness and the certainty of it all has the effect of unscrewing, of slackening, of "materializing" our membership. Besides the slackening effect, this wideness and completeness has also the effect of liberation. Ontologically baptism is the true liberation of man. But this liberation has as result in the psychological order that not only the spiritual but all human energies are set free. This sense of freedom implies on this earth greater possibilities of sinning, and these possibilities increase, so to speak, whenever we find our ontological freedom widened and deepened, *e.g.*, through the sacrament of Order. And this is the psychological explanation of "ecclesiastical materialism."

From all this, I hope, it will be clear that the question of "ecclesiastical materialism" is a very complicated and delicate one. It simply does not do for somebody born and bred in a non-Catholic atmosphere to compare what he liked formerly with what he finds now in the Catholic Church. It is not so easy to understand the Catholic mentality, perhaps still less easy to adapt oneself to it when one meets it after the period of formation. The first thing which stands out in the average Catholic is his completely *personal* attitude towards God. Unless he is a philosopher he will never speak of the "Deity," of the "Unknown": for him God is supremely personal, creation a personal act of a personal love, and what St. Paul would call his "election" an act of personal predilection. Hence the familiarity of Catholics with God; hence their attaching more importance to personal contact with God than discussions about Him; hence the fact that the Mass which contains all, or even devotional manifestations round the Blessed Sacrament, will appeal more strongly to them than the Bible: the Bible is far from being neglected, but also far from being given the exaggerated importance of Protestantism; after all, the Bible is given us to reveal God to us, and when we have God in the Mass and the other Sacraments, do we not hold the Revelation as well? Is all this "materialism?" I do not deny that stressing the one may lead to neglecting the other, and I do not approve in the least of neglecting any aspect, however small, of the Church's life, but in those who condemn so much and so sweepingly as sheer materialism without having taken the trouble to ask themselves whether they are prepared for such a judgment and in possession of the necessary data, I should like to see greater understanding, greater depth, greater delicacy, and, perhaps, more love for the *novitas* of Catholic Christianity (the only true because the only complete) than for the fleshpots of Egypt. And when such accusations bear on the Church "relying on the rich for her government" (which does not seem to leave much to the practice of charity as Christ recommended it) or on the "extreme callousness in regard to animal suffering," one is allowed to ask whether there is any relevancy at all in a book called *The Catholic Centre*.

Lastly, the positive thesis of Mr. Watkin, on which I may be very short. It is true that in the first pages there are two paragraphs which made me expect a fine development of the organic philosophy implied in the Catholic Liturgy. But this hope was left unfulfilled. And when I saw that, at bottom, Mr. Watkin did not grasp the relation between individual contemplation and the Liturgy, nor the real value of the Mass as an experience, and on the other hand saw him sum up his

final wish : " A relay of psalmody before the Blessed Sacrament exposed," I confess, I wrung my hands in despair.

If I may be allowed to express a personal opinion, I would say that Mr. Watkin's thought lacks continuity and shows immaturity (or whatever it may be) in his combination of flashes of spiritual beauty and floods of personal reactions with too little historical sense to make the balance. I also hope that he has noted that I have purposely refrained from all "ecclesiastical" discouragement since I entirely agree with Mr. Watkin that thought and expression should not be "ecclesiastic" but fully shared by our laymen. That Mr. Watkin has done his share with generosity I want to be the first to admit, even though I do not agree with many of his statements, or rather his general approach. I hope that many laymen with Mr. Watkin's talents and stimulated by his works will see the *noblesse* of the task which this Catholic philosopher set himself, and in which he should not be isolated.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

Théologie de la Mystique. By Dom Anselm Stolz. Editions des Bénédictins d'Amay (Chevetogne), 1939. Pp. viii, 260. 20 fr.

Here is the promised French edition of Dom Anselm's Salzburg lectures, which we reviewed in the last number of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY in the German edition of 1936. The present form of the work differs from this first edition only in that its readable and accurate French translation does sometimes weaken the power of the German, while maintaining the essential sense intact, and in the many notes and minor additions made by Dom Anselm himself. These additions strengthen or clarify his position. When his book first appeared it was at once greeted for the undeniable force it is. On the blurb Fr. Congar is quoted, calling the book : " one of the most substantial and most stimulating which have appeared in past years in the sphere of scientific religious literature." This did not prevent an attack, by F. Penido (of all theologians !) in the *Revue Thomiste* (1937), from declaring Dom Anselm hostile to the Western tradition of theology from Augustine onwards and to the development in the theology of mysticism to be found in the work of St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross.

The French translation, while adding a few new texts and examples from the mystics, had only to reproduce for the rest the sense of the German text in order to assert against this attack Dom Anselm's position. His position is essentially central. His intention is to sketch a synthesis of the theology

of mysticism found in the Fathers and in the scholastics. His discovery is that the essence of mysticism is to be placed on the level of the supernatural life of the soul, and not on that of the effect this life normally or by abnormal privilege produces in the action of the soul's faculties. The action of the faculties he calls psychology, and he says that mysticism, having its root in the grace which divinizes the being of the soul (ontological level) need have no extraordinary, abnormal effects in the action of the soul's faculties (psychological level). Normal effects on the psychological level it must have, for the soul only acts by its faculties; this normal working of the faculties constitutes that health or organic harmony in human action which Dom Theodore Wesseling calls the key to liturgical mysticism (*Liturgy and Life*, p. 89f., 111f.). Abnormal effects on the psychological level are sometimes present, not as essential to mysticism, but as God's manifestation of the divine life of Christians to the world. Such psychological events, unlike the uniform surface presented by perfect harmony, stand out in an observable manner and, as observables, are the object of the science of psychology. Modern studies of mysticism have too exclusively studied it as an object of psychology, and this because the fifteenth-century scholastics, and with them the mystics whose intellectual life was one with theirs, have limited their attention to the abnormal psychological effects sometimes following mysticism, which is the development of the transpsychological life of grace. If Dom Anselm has only mentioned such mystics in a passing manner he can hardly be blamed. Given the intention of his book, to lay the stress elsewhere was in no way to underestimate the Spanish school, which he explicitly recognizes as complementary, bringing as it does a real progress to our knowledge of the psychological side of mysticism. But Dom Anselm's task was to show that this was neither the only side nor the main side.

Appreciation of the ontological value of mysticism led necessarily to appreciation of its ontological basis—the redeeming work of Christ; and its summit on earth—the Holy Eucharist. In his study of these and of all they imply Dom Anselm has naturally used all the chief representatives of the Church's thought. He could not limit himself to Augustine and Thomas. He has appealed to their forerunners and contemporaries and his thought is consequently as wide as that of the Church. But nowhere does he treat the Fathers as Easterns and Westerns. His argument does lead him to divide them—regretfully, for he stresses how Christian doctrine forms one whole—into pre-Augustinian and post-Augustinian, but it is impossible to reproach him with the

uneirenic attitude which opposes East to West. As the book stands, the question does not arise, but replying to his attacker in the 1938 *Revue Thomiste* he shows that should it be mooted his position would again be central. For him patristics and scholasticism form a whole, scholastic theology of mysticism is completed by scholastic psychology of mysticism, East and West are complementary, and would be said to be so if any division was made between them anywhere in the book. In fact there seems to be nothing about it, though the Introduction of the French translator introduces the Greek Fathers as such, saying that they were the chief contemplators of the mysteries of the Redemption placed by Dom Anselm at the root of Christian mysticism; they, it seems, saw the Transfiguration as a palpable manifestation of the divine in the human, thus the completest example of mysticism; the Latins followed them and their ideas were especially embodied in the mystical teaching of Gregory the Great (p. vi). We think this paragraph a pity. Dom Anselm defines mysticism as "the experience of the insertion of the believer into the stream of the divine life, which he reaches by the Sacraments, especially the Eucharist" (p. 255). As he shows previously the Sacraments insert us into the redeeming-act, an essentially dynamic process. This dynamic realism, this concrete Christian life of the Sacraments where all his own life and the visible world are for the Christian the veil of Christ's hidden working, is to be most especially found in the earliest Roman Fathers (e.g., Clement, Hippolytus) and also in the other parts of the Christian world. In this conception the Transfiguration (see St. Leo on this) is taken as an *action* of Christ and as an integral part of the redeeming-act. Easterns like Origen and Gregory of Nyssa shared these dynamic and realistic conceptions, and it is unfair to class together as "the East" such liturgical philosophers as Origen and the intellectualistic Byzantines who were so apt to take the Transfiguration as a static intellectual manifestation, not an act of redemption, and whom Gregory the Great, meeting in their intellectual atmosphere on his political missions to Constantinople, doubtless admired so much that once back in Rome he forgot the Western tradition and, as this introduction says, "followed" the Easterns in his work on mystical life, preferring, as is clear from all his writings, moralistic and intellectualistic symbolism to the realistic dynamic Sacramental mysticism studied by Dom Anselm. Dom Anselm, in his "experience of sacramental life" has located mystical experience in its proper place—the mysterious confines where the essence and the faculties meet—and has thus the key to the synthesis of ontological realism and the keen psychological studies of our

time, therefore to the synthesis of old theology and new individualism, to the organic whole demanded from every science by liturgical philosophy. He is not harking back to any previous century—he is preparing the liturgical Church of to-morrow.

DOM WILLIAM McLAUGHLIN

St. John Chrysostom. By Donald Attwater. (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, U.S.A. English publisher : Geo. E. J. Coldwell, 17 Red Lion Passage, London, W.C.1.) pp. 201. 8s. *id.*

This is both a readable and an accurate life of the saint. It places him in his right setting and it makes abundant use of extracts from his own writings.

There is something specially fascinating about the great patristic doctors of the Church : they seem to belong to any period or even to any part of the Church, and yet (the present example is a case in point) they retain their own individuality and all their national characteristics. John Chrysostom, the monk, the priest, the preacher and the bishop, are each considered and considered in detail, and so are the more outstanding incidents of his life. There is also a good bibliographical note, and better still, notes on his own written works.

One would like to see a similar treatment of all the Doctors of the Church.

B.W.

Dürers Rosenkranzfest en de Ikonografie der Duitse Rosenkransgroepen van de XV en het gegin der XVI Eeuw. Dr. F. H. A. van den Oudendijk Pieterse. (De Spiegel, Amsterdam : Het Kompas, Antwerp). 9 guilders.

This book, written as a doctor's thesis in the State University of Utrecht, is a large compendium of the history of the devotion of the rosary during the Middle Ages towards the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It contains about six hundred pages and numerous illustrations, and is very well produced.

The book deals primarily with Albrecht Dürer's famous picture on the rosary (1506), which is now at Prague. In the opinion of the authoress, Dürer's picture ought not to be classed with other pictures on the same subject. Usually, in these pictures, people offer their crowns of roses or other flowers to the Virgin ; Dürer's picture, on the contrary, shows us the Blessed Virgin, with the help of St. Dominic and some others, distributing crowns among the venerating crowd. Skilfully Dr. Van den Oudenijk develops her opinion which is derived from a deep knowledge of the medieval German, Netherlands and Latin literature, and from her many journeys

and visits to museums all over Europe. It is her hypothesis that Dürer's inspiration was drawn from contact with Celtes and his Roswitha edition (p. 104).

For the rest, the book is an outstanding one, as it gives us a wide history on the Rosary in medieval life and society. Dr. Van den Oudendijk cleverly finds the origins of devotion towards the Blessed Virgin in the very beginnings of Christianity, long before it was promulgated by the Council (p. 161). An exhaustive study covering some hundreds of pages, with quotations and conclusions, shows how the Middle Ages are sometimes rightly called the "Marian epoch." The historical development of the "Hail Mary" in its present form is clearly shown, together with the different forms of the Dominican, Franciscan, Brigittine and other variations of the Rosary. It is especially interesting to see how the authoress traces everywhere in literature the "Rose" as the symbol of all that is pure, holy and virgin.

The only adverse criticism that can be made is that the book is written in the Netherlands language. This makes it rather difficult for many people to profit by the material collected in the work.

DR. JOH. HARTOG.

Place de la Liturgie dans la Tradition des Lettres Grecques. By Dr. Sophie Antoniadis. (Sijthoff's, Publishers, Leiden, Netherlands).

Dr. Antoniadis, professor of late-classic Greek at the University of Leiden, Netherlands, after some introductory remarks, gives the Greek text of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, together with a very well elaborated French translation. She then devotes a chapter to the scriptural quotations and the relations between the present form and earlier forms of this well known Liturgy. As the title shows, the first part is meant only as an introduction to the following part: an exposition of the language, style and rhythm. The third part contains a very interesting collection of quotations from the Fathers and from the earliest ecclesiastical writers on the Greek Liturgy, together with an *exposé* on the place of the Liturgy in Greek literature. This is followed by a study on the place of the Liturgy in modern Greek folklore and history. From a linguistic point of view, the chapter on *Expressions in daily life taken from the Liturgy* is very important.

As an appendix there follow (p. 251 sqq.), the texts of the so-called Clementine Liturgy, of the Liturgy of St. James, St. Mark, and the prayers proper to the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil (present time). The texts of these liturgies are given only in Greek.

The authoress does not view the Divine Liturgy from the Christian, Catholic or even from the religious standpoint. She deals only with its literary value. For Dr. Antoniadis the Divine Liturgy is the monument of sixteen ages, full of antique civilisation and of beautiful ideas and expressions of Christianity, and containing a wealth of historical memories. She regards it as having, to a certain extent, contributed to the formation of modern Greek thought and speech (p. 250). Nevertheless, this conclusion is modified by the fine words with which the authoress explains some of the prayers.

Dr. Antoniadis's Greek origin and perfect knowledge of the French language have combined to produce a very valuable work. For those who are interested in the East, this book will prove a helpful guide, especially in explaining many features of Greek life. Dr. Antoniadis earns our thanks for this remarkable book.

From a dogmatic point of view, a Catholic reviewer has to draw attention to some inaccuracies.

DR. JOH. HARTOG.

The Eastern Churches. St. Michael's Guild. (140 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.). 10 cents.

The Guild of St. Michael is to be congratulated on producing this pamphlet. It contains three articles: the charter of all present day Catholic work for reunion with the Eastern Church, viz., a translation of *Orientalium Rerum* of Pius XI; an account of Leonidas Fedorov and of the Catholic Russians by Donald Attwater; and an article "Catholics—Roman but not Latin," by Gerard Donnelly, S.J.

Leonidas Fedorov is one of the most inspiring figures of recent days among Catholics of the Byzantine rite, born in 1879 into an Orthodox family and from childhood attracted to the monastic life—"not to flee the world and its sins but to seek the contemplation of eternity." After studying for two years patristics at the Orthodox theological academy at Petersburg, he made his profession of Catholic faith at Rome. He then studied at Anagni and Fribourg, was ordained priest at Constantinople in 1911, and two years later became a monk at the Studite Monastery then at Kamenica in Bosnia. In 1914 he returned to Russia and began his apostolate—his policy was definitely eirenical, making friends with the Orthodox and their clergy. He was imprisoned for ten years by the Bolsheviks and died on March 7th, 1935.

Two or three of the last pages are devoted to other champions of present day Russian Catholicism and to the actual present conditions of the "Russian Mission." One hopes that all taking part will look to the Exarch Fedorov as their model.

Father Donnelly's article is a straight talk about Catholic Oriental usages very necessary, it should do much good.

The English C.T.S. would do well to publish like useful pamphlets about the Eastern Church.

B.W.

Judaism and Christianity. Essay presented to the Rev. W. Paul P. Levertoff, D.D. Edited by Fr. Lev Gillet of the Russian Church, Paris. (J. B. Shears & Sons, London). 1939.

Some of these essays deal with Jewish and Judæo-Christian Liturgy and among these we find Dr. Levertoff's "Judæo-Christian Liturgy" in Latin. This is a remarkable piece of work, expressing many sound Christologic notions in both Old and New Testament phraseology such as the Revelation of God through Christ, the Redemption and Atonement of Christ, the Ebed Jahweh of Isaias, the Words of the Consecration at Mass, Christ as the Word of God, Image of the Invisible God and Splendour of His Glory, etc. This latter notion is treated in the Editor's essay "Questions concernant la Chékinah," which states very clearly the various problems that have still to be solved as regards the notion that Christ is for the Jew the supreme realization of the Shekinah. One essay has as title "The Problem of a Jewish-Christian Branch of the Catholic Church" and fosters still the hope that Anglo-Catholicism is a branch of the Catholic Church 'tout court'. This should not astonish us in this book, for Levertoff, although he had come into contact with Christians of Poland, Germany and Palestine, found sufficient broadmindedness only in the Liberal Catholicism of the Church of England. He was eventually ordained by the Archbishop of Wales to the ministry of that church (cf. p. 100). "He realized that such service as he could render to his people and to their Messiah could best be given through the priesthood of that Church which, with all its historical disabilities and natural shortcomings, combines intellectual freedom with ecclesiastical authority, and values equally the Catholic sense of order and the sturdy evangelical emphasis on spiritual democracy and the rights of the laity. Through such a 'bridge-church' much might be achieved for the welfare of the Jewish people, and much for the increase of understanding among Christians." A bridge to what? Let us hope to that Church where the Jew will find the whole Messiah, where they still believe as ever before that the Messiah is the Word and the Word is God.

E.L.W.

